

REMARKS/ARGUMENT

The Examiner has identified 16 species in the application with Species A illustrated in figs. 1a-1d, Species B illustrated in figs. 3a-3c, Species C illustrated in figs. 4-8, Species D illustrated in fig. 9, Species E illustrated in FIG. 10, Species F illustrated in fig. 11a-11c, Species G illustrated in figs. 12a-12c, Species H illustrated in figs. 12a-12b Species I illustrated in figs. 13c-13d, species J illustrated in fig. 14, Species K illustrated in figs. 15 and 16a, Species L illustrated in figs. 16b and 16c, Species M illustrated in figs. 17a, 17b, and 18, Species N illustrated in figs. 17c, 17d, and 17e, Species O illustrated in figs. 10a-20i and 21 and Species P illustrated in figs. 22a, 22b and 22c.

Applicants have elected Species B as illustrated in figs. 3a -3c for examination herein and hereby identify claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 16-19 as drawn to the elected species.

Applicants respectfully contend that the Examiner's identification of figs. 4-8 as disclosing a species is in error and therefore traverse. Figs. 4-7 comprise illustrations of various structures for the break screen 13 and detonators 14 of fig. 3c. Applicants contend that claims 1, 2, and 5 are generic as to the embodiments of figs. 3a-3c and figs. 4-7. However, applicants concur that fig. 8 shows an alternative embodiment of the invention with an optical sensing system which may be an alternative sensing element to the break screen of the embodiment/species of figs. 3a-c. Applicants contend however that claim 1 is generic as to the embodiment of fig. 8.

Similarly, applicants respectfully contend that the Examiner's identification of figs. 17a and 17b and 18 as a species is incorrect and therefore traverse. Figs. 17a and 17b merely illustrate an exemplary application on a HMMWV vehicle of the embodiment of either figs. 15 and 16a or fig. 16b or fig. 16c on an exemplary vehicle. Fig. 18 on the other hand is merely a detailed view of elements shown in fig. 15 for greater clarity.

The applicants also respectfully contend that the Examiner's identification of figs. 20a-20i and 21 as a species is incorrect and therefore traverse. Fig. 21 is again an illustration of an exemplary application on a helicopter of the embodiment of either figs. 15 and 16a or fig. 16b. Figs. 20a-20i are a sequential flow diagram of the interception of an RPG threat by an embodiment as shown in figs. 15 and 16a or fig. 16b.

Applicant's respectfully contend that claim 1 is generic to the species identified by the Examiner as Species A, B, D, E, F, G, H and I and to a species defined by fig. 8 as argued above.

If additional information is required, please contact the undersigned as counsel of record.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Felix L. Fischer', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Date: 05/08/2009

Felix L. Fischer, Reg. No. 31,614
1607 Mission Drive, Suite 204
Solvang, CA 93461
Telephone: 805-693-0685
Fax: 805-693-0735